

ought to be the bill funding the Department of Defense. Our fundamental obligation is to provide for the common defense of our country, and all Members feel our responsibility to keep the Nation safe.

Fortunately, the caps agreement specifically allows us to increase defense funding to meet the growing threats our Nation faces. Yet here is where we are: One week in, our Democratic colleagues tried to stonewall the defense funding bill in committee and are now indicating they may even filibuster a motion to begin considering the House-passed defense funding bill later this week.

There is only one way to read this. Some of our Democratic colleagues have determined they would rather stage a political fight with President Trump than secure the resources that our uniformed commanders urgently need to do their jobs. National security is taking a back seat to partisan politics.

Let's be absolutely clear about the concerns and the priorities that our Democratic friends are de-prioritizing. The defense spending measure would bolster efforts to modernize our forces and build the U.S. military of the future. Russia is actively modernizing its own forces, just as we have seen the Putin regime step up its brazen steps to exert its destabilizing influence well beyond its borders. In China, the last decade has seen military spending nearly double. Our regional partners continue to feel the tightening grip of the Chinese Communist Party on trade and strategic activity throughout the Indo-Pacific region while the technological ripples of Chinese cyber meddling are felt right here at home.

In the face of surging great-power adversaries, simple upkeep is not enough to keep America and our allies safe from aggression. Comprehensive funding for research, development, and readiness programs is what is needed. In Afghanistan, Syria, Somalia, Yemen, and beyond, we continue to face sustained threats from terrorist organizations. In the Middle East, we have seen how Iran's bid for regional hegemony and its investment in terror, missiles, and cyber activities threaten the United States, our allies and partners, key shipping lanes, and global energy markets.

This bipartisan Defense bill would help us to adapt to meet these new threats while ensuring our commanders can prosecute existing operations without being consumed by the instability of short-term continuing resolutions. Yet our Democratic colleagues would rather provoke a partisan feud with the President. They would rather have a fight with the President than stick to the agreement we all made. At least that is where we are as of the moment.

I remain hopeful that my friends on the Democratic side will join us in honoring the terms of the agreement that has been struck by the President and

the Speaker and help us to reboot a bipartisan funding process. The readiness and modernization of America's military and the safety of the American people should not play second fiddle to our Democratic colleagues' political strategy.

#### BRETT KAVANAUGH

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, on a completely different matter, for anybody who has been reading the news over the past few days, it has probably felt a little like Groundhog Day because over the last couple of days, leading Democrats have tried to grab on to yet another poorly sourced, thinly reported, unsubstantiated allegation against Justice Brett Kavanaugh. There they go again. Call it a 1-year anniversary reenactment with Senate Democrats reopening the sad and embarrassing chapter they wrote last September.

The latest allegation was blasted out by a major newspaper despite the apparent lack of any corroborating evidence whatsoever. The reporting was so thin that the story ran not in the news section but on the opinion page. In fact, they have already had to issue an enormous correction. The writers conveniently failed to note that the supposed victim herself declined to be interviewed, and several of her friends say she has no memory of any such thing happening.

We all remember this pattern from the last time around: Shoot first, and correct the facts later. Here is another familiar pattern: Just like last September, little things like facts and evidence didn't stop the Democrats from rushing to exploit this. Even as the media was trying to backpedal, a number of the Democratic Presidential candidates were hysterically calling for Justice Kavanaugh to be impeached on the basis of this flimsy, uncorroborated story. They were calling for Justice Kavanaugh to be impeached. That includes several of our own Senate colleagues. Even after the massive correction, no one in that group has backed off his ridiculous threat.

This laughable suggestion is already earning scorn throughout the country and across the political spectrum. A majority of Senators and the American people rightly rejected the politics of unsubstantiated personal destruction just last year. It is just as transparent and self-serving today, 1 year later.

Yet it would be a mistake to dismiss this as a bad case of sour grapes. This is not just a leftwing obsession with one man; it is part of a deliberate effort to attack judicial independence. Six of the Democratic Presidential candidates—plus one who has now quit to run for the Senate—have publicly flirted with packing the Supreme Court—Court packing. Today's bold, new Democratic idea is a failed power grab from back in the 1930s.

Just a few weeks ago, some Senate Democrats nakedly threatened the Su-

preme Court Justices in writing. Our colleagues sent the Court an outlandish brief, gravely intoning that the "Supreme Court is not well," they said. "The Supreme Court is not well." Here was the punch line: Either issue rulings we like or we will pack the Court.

This is not normal political behavior. These are the actions of a political party whose agenda is so alien to the Constitution that it feels threatened by fair and faithful judges.

This is what I would say: When the simple notion that judges should be faithful to the Constitution looks like an attack on your agenda, maybe it is your agenda that needs a makeover, not our independent judiciary. When you are this willing to launch unhinged personal attacks, you reveal a whole lot more about your own radicalism than about the men and women you target.

This is my commitment and the commitment of all of my Republican colleagues: As long as we remain in the Senate, we will fight to preserve our fair and independent judiciary.

#### LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, EDUCATION, DEFENSE, STATE, FOREIGN OPERATIONS, AND ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2020—Motion to Proceed

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to Calendar No. 140, H.R. 2740.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 140, H.R. 2740, making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes.

#### CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

#### CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to H.R. 2740, a bill making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes.

Mitch McConnell, Roger F. Wicker, John Cornyn, Richard C. Shelby, John Barrasso, Johnny Isakson, Richard Burr, Thom Tillis, Mike Rounds, Jerry Moran, Mike Crapo, James E. Risch, John Boozman, Roy Blunt, John Thune, David Perdue, John Hoeven.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.